



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/529,071

09/30/2005

Chuan-Yuan Li

180/156 PCT/US

6572

25297 7590 10/23/2009
JENKINS, WILSON, TAYLOR & HUNT, P. A.
Suite 1200 UNIVERSITY TOWER
3100 TOWER BLVD.,
DURHAM, NC 27707

EXAMINER

LONG, SCOTT

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1633

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

10/23/2009

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/529,071	Applicant(s) LI ET AL.	
	Examiner SCOTT LONG	Art Unit 1633	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 July 2009.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-8 and 15-39 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 17-20 and 22-36 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-8,15,16,21,37 and 38 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>9/3/2009</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

The examiner acknowledges receipt of Applicant's Remarks and Claim amendments, filed on 21 October 2009.

Claim Status

Claims 1, 3-8 and 15-39 are pending. Claims 2 and 9-14 are cancelled. Claims 17-20 and 22-36 are withdrawn from further consideration by the Examiner, pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to non-elected inventions, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Claims 1, 3-8, 21 and 37-39 are under current examination.

Information Disclosure Statement

The Information Disclosure Statements (IDS) filed on 3 September 2009 consisting of 1 sheet(s) is/are in compliance with 37 CFR 1.97. Accordingly, examiner has considered the Information Disclosure Statements.

Priority

This application claims benefit as a 371 of PCT/US03/31097 (filed 10/01/2003) which claims benefit of 60/415,319 (filed 10/01/2002). The applicant submitted an oath on 3/24/2005, which was not executed in accordance with there 37 CFR 1.66 or 37 CFR 1.68. The applicant was notified of this in the DO/EO filed 8/1/2005. Since the instant application is a National Stage Application, rather than a standard US non-provisional

Art Unit: 1633

application, the application was not afforded the filing date 3/24/2005 (when the specification, claims, and drawings were submitted). Rather, the instant application has been granted the filing date of 9/30/2005, which is the date on which a properly executed oath was received. Because receipt of the properly executed oath completed filing of the National Stage application within the 30 month period for filing of the National Stage application of PCT/US03/31097, the instant application has been granted the benefit date, 1 October 2002 from provisional application 60/415,319.

RESPONSE TO ARGUMENTS

35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claims 1, 3-8, 15-16, and 21 remain rejected under 35 USC 102(a/e) as anticipated by Van Meir et al. (WO02/26192).

Applicant's arguments (Remarks, page 10) filed 6 July 2009 have been fully considered but they are unpersuasive.

Despite the applicant's comments to the contrary, instant claim 1 is directed to an adenovirus vector comprising one adenovirus gene and one transgene, each under the transcriptional control of a transcriptional control of a TRE (transcriptional regulator element).

The applicant argues that Van Meir et al. do not teach each and every limitation of the instant claims. In particular, the applicant argues that Van Meir do not teach the adenovirus E1B gene is under the transcriptional control of a TRE (transcriptional regulator element). Contrary to the applicant's assertion, Van Meir et al. teach each and every limitation of the instant claims. In particular, Van Meir et al. teach the limitations regarding conditional expression of adenoviral genes, and specifically teach conditional expression of E1B. Van Meir et al. teach, "recombinant adenoviruses were able to express constitutively (Ad-CMV-E1) or conditionally (HYPR-Ad1) E1A and E1B gene products." (page 34, lines 1-2 and Fig. 6). The applicant points out that Van Meir teach "E1A is activated by hypoxia in HYPR-Ad1. E1A is known to activate the expression of other viral promoters including early E1B gene regulation. This explains the increased expression of E1B gene products under hypoxia." (Remarks, page 10; Van Meir, page 33, lines 25-27). Therefore, Van Meir et al. teach that the adenovirus E1B gene is under indirect conditional control of the TRE. According to the breadth of the instant claims, the examiner concludes that Van Meir satisfies the limitations of the instant claims. Therefore, applicant's arguments are unpersuasive.

The applicant further argues that Van Meir et al. does not teach an adenovirus vector comprising two adenovirus gene, wherein each is under the transcription control of a TRE (Remarks, page 10, lines 17-19, emphasis added by applicant). The applicant indicates that these comments are directed to claim 3 which is directed to the adenovirus vector of claim 1, further comprising a second adenovirus gene under the transcriptional control of the TRE. Van Meir et al. teach, "recombinant adenoviruses were able to express ... conditionally (HYPR-Ad1) E1A and E1B gene products." (page 34, lines 1-2). See also Figure 6. To reiterate, Van Meir teaches two adenovirus genes under the transcriptional control of the TRE, E1A being directly under the control of the TRE and E1b being indirectly under the control of the TRE. Therefore, the applicant's arguments are unpersuasive.

Accordingly, the examiner hereby maintains the rejection of claims 1, 3-8, 15-16, and 21 under 35 USC 102(a/e) as anticipated by Van Meir et al.

The examiner reiterates the instant rejection below:

Claims 1, 3-8, 15-16, and 21 are rejected under 35 USC 102(a/e) as anticipated by Van Meir et al. (WO02/26192).

Claim 1 is directed to an adenovirus vector comprising an adenovirus gene and a transgene, each under the transcriptional control of a transcriptional regulatory element (TRE) comprising a minimal promoter and a hypoxia responsive element (HRE), wherein the adenovirus gene is selected from the group consisting of an E1B gene, an E2A gene, an E2B gene and an E4 gene, wherein the transgene is a suicide gene selected from the group consisting of a TNF- α gene, a Trail gene, a Bax gene, an HSV-

Art Unit: 1633

tk gene, a cytosine deaminase gene, a p450 gene and a diphtheria toxin gene, an s-Flt1 gene and an ex-Flt gene.

BASIC INVENTIVE CONCEPT: Van Meir et al. teach, “a recombinant virus genetically engineered to have a hypoxia-responsive element, or a multiplicity of such elements, operably linked to a promoter which is operably linked to a gene or genes which regulate or modulate replication of the virus or encode a therapeutic molecule.” (page 7, lines 18-21). Van Meir et al. further describe the recombinant virus as “a recombinant replication-competent adenovirus” and “an hypoxia/HIF-dependent replicative adenovirus” (page 9, lines 10 and 13). Van Meir et al. teach an adenovirus containing the CMV minimal promoter, hypoxia-response elements, and the E1 gene (page 28, Figure at line 1).

EACH GENE UNDER CONTROL OF HYPOXIC PROMOTER: Van Meir et al. teach, “a recombinant virus genetically engineered to have an hypoxia-responsive element, or a multiplicity of such elements, operably linked to a promoter which is operably linked to a gene or genes which regulate or modulate replication of the virus or encode a therapeutic molecule.” (page 7, lines 18-21). Van Meir et al. clearly indicate that both (1) genes required for viral replication and (2) therapeutic genes can be placed under control of promoters comprising hypoxia responsive elements. Van Meir et al. demonstrate a specific embodiment of this type: “a viral construct comprising an hypoxia-dependent replicative adenovirus (HYPR-Ad(s)) that expresses an anti-angiogenic factor under hypoxic conditions (HYPRA-Ad)” (page 13, lines 26-28). Furthermore, Van Meir et al. teach “a plurality of genes can be expressed in response to

Art Unit: 1633

hypoxia” (page 20, lines 4-5). Van Meir et al. teach “molecular strategy underlying the design of virus mediated gene therapy systems is to deliver a gene which will inhibit tumor cell growth (e.g., controlling cell cycle or apoptosis), kill the cell (suicide gene), or induce an immune response (immunotherapy).” (page 2, lines 16-18). Van Meir et al. also teach that thymidine kinase is one of the therapeutic suicide genes which can be used in their invention (page 19, lines 28-29 through page 20, line 1). Van Meir et al. teach, “recombinant adenoviruses were able to express...conditionally (HYPR-Ad1) E1A and E1B gene products.” (page 34, lines 1-2). The examiner concludes that Van Meir et al envisioned an embodiment of their invention in which both (1) the adenovirus gene, E1B, and (2) the thymidine kinase gene would be under the control of a hypoxic promoter.

Claim 3 is directed to the adenovirus vector of claim 1, further comprising a second adenovirus gene under the transcriptional control of the TRE. Van Meir et al. teach, “recombinant adenoviruses were able to express ... conditionally (HYPR-Ad1) E1A and E1B gene products.” (page 34, lines 1-2). See also Figure 6. To reiterate, Van Meir teaches two adenovirus genes under the transcriptional control of the TRE.

Claim 4 is directed to the adenovirus vector of claim 1, wherein the minimal promoter is selected from the group consisting of the cytomegalovirus (CMV) minimal promoter, the human β -actin minimal promoter, the human EF2 minimal promoter, and the adenovirus E1B minimal promoter. Van Meir et al. teach an adenovirus “containing the CMV minimal promoter and the E1 gene” (page 12, line 1).

Claim 5 is directed to the adenovirus vector of claim 4, wherein the CMV minimal promoter comprises SEQ ID NO: 1. Van Meir et al. teach an adenovirus “containing the CMV minimal promoter” (page 12, line 1).

Claim 6 is directed to the adenovirus vector of claim 1, wherein the HRE is derived from the human vascular endothelial growth factor (VEGF) promoter. Van Meir et al. teach, “based on this information, EPO and VEGF HRE’s were chosen for the design and testing of a hypoxia-responsive promoter” (page 19, lines 1-2).

Claim 7 is directed to the adenovirus vector of claim 6, wherein the HRE comprises SEQ ID NO: 2. Van Meir et al. teach “the VEGF [HRE] sequence... CCACAGTGC TACGTGGGCT CCUCAGGTC CTCTT” which is 100% identical to SEQ ID NO:2 of the instant application.

Claim 8 is directed to the adenovirus vector of claim 7, wherein the HRE comprises five tandem copies of SEQ ID NO: 2. See Van Meir et al., Figure 2, where up to 6 tandem copies of HRE are shown and page 10-11 for detailed description of figure.

Claim 15 is directed to a composition comprising the adenovirus vector of claim 1. Van Meir et al. teach, “compositions of the invention comprise a recombinant virus genetically engineered to have an hypoxia-responsive element, or a multiplicity of such elements, operably linked to a promoter which is operably linked to a gene or genes which regulate or modulate replication of the virus or encode a therapeutic molecule.” (page 7, lines 18-21).

Art Unit: 1633

Claim 16 is directed to the composition of claim 15, further comprising a pharmaceutically acceptable carrier. Inherently, any aqueous solution of the adenoviral composition of claim 15 would be a pharmaceutically acceptable carrier.

Claim 21 is directed to a host cell comprising the adenovirus vector of claim 1. Van Meir et al. teach, "expression of recombinant viral gene products in transfected cells under hypoxic and normoxic conditions.... adenoviruses, U251MG and LN-229 cells were infected with the Ad-CMV-E1 and HYPR-Ad1" (page 33, lines 17-29).

Accordingly, Van Meir et al. anticipated the instant claims.

Therefore, the examiner hereby maintains the rejection of claims 1-8, 15-16, and 21 under 35 USC 102(a/e) as anticipated by Van Meir et al. (WO02/26192) for the reasons of record and the comments above.

35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

Art Unit: 1633

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Meir et al.

Claim 37 remains rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Van Meir et al. (WO02/26192) for the reasons of record and the comments below.

The applicant's arguments have been fully considered but are unpersuasive.

The applicant states "Applicants respectfully submit that the discussion hereinabove regarding the deficiencies of the teachings of Van Meir et al., with regard to the rejection of claims 1, 3-8, 15-16 and 21 under 35 USC 102(a/e) equally applies to the instant rejection of claim 37 under 35 USC 103(a). The examiner refers the applicant to the examiner's comments hereinabove regarding the purported deficiencies of the teachings of Van Meir et al., with regard to the rejection of claims 1, 3-8, 15-16

Art Unit: 1633

and 21 under 35 USC 102(a/e). Accordingly, the applicant's arguments are unpersuasive.

Therefore, the examiner hereby maintains the rejection of claim 37 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Van Meir et al.

The examiner reiterates the pending rejection:

Claim 37 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Van Meir et al. (WO02/26192).

Claim 37 is directed to an adenovirus vector comprising two adenovirus genes and a transgene, each under the transcriptional control of a transcriptional regulatory element (TRE) comprising a minimal promoter and a hypoxia responsive element (HRE), wherein the adenovirus gene is selected from the group consisting of an E1B gene, an E2A gene, an E2B gene and an E4 gene, wherein the transgene is a suicide gene selected from the group consisting of a TNF- α gene, a Trail gene, a Bax gene, an HSV-tk gene, a cytosine deaminase gene, a p450 gene and a diphtheria toxin gene, an s-Flt1 gene and an ex-Flt gene.

BASIC INVENTIVE CONCEPT: Van Meir et al. teach, "a recombinant virus genetically engineered to have an hypoxia-responsive element, or a multiplicity of such elements, operably linked to a promoter which is operably linked to a gene or genes which regulate or modulate replication of the virus or encode a therapeutic molecule." (page 7, lines 18-21). Van Meir et al. further describe the recombinant virus as "a recombinant replication-competent adenovirus" and "an hypoxia/HIF-dependent replicative adenovirus" (page 9, lines 10 and 13). Van Meir et al. teach an adenovirus

Art Unit: 1633

containing the CMV minimal promoter, hypoxia-response elements, and the E1 gene (page 28, Figure at line 1).

EACH GENE UNDER CONTROL OF HYPOXIC PROMOTER: Van Meir et al. teach, “a recombinant virus genetically engineered to have an hypoxia-responsive element, or a multiplicity of such elements, operably linked to a promoter which is operably linked to a gene or genes which regulate or modulate replication of the virus or encode a therapeutic molecule.” (page 7, lines 18-21). Van Meir et al. clearly indicate that both (1) genes required for viral replication and (2) therapeutic genes can be placed under control of promoters comprising hypoxia responsive elements. Van Meir et al. demonstrate a specific embodiment of this type: “a viral construct comprising an hypoxia-dependent replicative adenovirus (HYPR-Ad(s)) that expresses an anti-angiogenic factor under hypoxic conditions (HYPRA-Ad)” (page 13, lines 26-28). Furthermore, Van Meir et al. teach “a plurality of genes can be expressed in response to hypoxia” (page 20, lines 4-5). Van Meir et al. teach “molecular strategy underlying the design of virus mediated gene therapy systems is to deliver a gene which will inhibit tumor cell growth (e.g., controlling cell cycle or apoptosis), kill the cell (suicide gene), or induce an immune response (immunotherapy).” (page 2, lines 16-18). Van Meir et al. also teach that thymidine kinase is one of the therapeutic suicide genes which can be used in their invention (page 19, lines 28-29 through page 20, line 1). Van Meir et al. teach, “recombinant adenoviruses were able to express...conditionally (HYPR-Ad1) E1A and E1B gene products.” (page 34, lines 1-2).

Art Unit: 1633

DEFICIENCIES: Van Meir et al. teaches the general idea of adenovirus vectors in which both (1) two adenovirus genes, (E1A and E1B), and (2) the thymidine kinase gene would be under the control of a hypoxic promoter. Additionally, Van Meir et al. teach "Using standard genetic engineering methods, any suitable promoter can be linked to HRE, which are then linked to a gene(s) in a particular virus that regulates or modulates virus replication. A variety of genes and/or their products are known to those skilled in the art that regulate or modulate viral replication." (page 18, lines 2-5). Van Meir et al. specifically uses E1A as an example of such genes. However, Van Meir et al. do not specifically teach the adenovirus genes E2A, E2B, or E4 can be among those genes regulated by hypoxia-responsive promoters. However, Meir et al. teach "E1B 55K, in conjunction with adenovirus E4orf6 gene product has two functions during viral production" (page 19, lines 23-24).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to the person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the teachings of Van Meir to construct an adenovirus comprising the two adenovirus genes, E1B and E4, each under the control of a hypoxia-responsive promoter, further comprising the suicide gene, thymidine kinase also under control of a hypoxia-responsive promoter.

The person of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to make that modification because Van Meir et al. suggest that any viral gene that regulates virus replication could be used in their invention and specifically mentions that E1B and E4 are such genes in adenovirus.

Art Unit: 1633

An artisan would have expected success, because Van Meir et al. demonstrates a specific embodiment of adenovirus comprising E1A and E1B operably linked to a hypoxic promoter. Therefore, a skilled artisan would expect substituting other adenovirus genes which control viral replication for either of these genes would be successful.

Therefore the adenovirus as taught by Van Meir et al would have been *prima facie* obvious over the adenovirus of the instant application.

Meir and Shibata

Claim 38 remains rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Van Meir et al. (WO02/26192) in view of Shibata et al. (International Journal of Radiation Oncology Biology Physics. 1998; 42(4): 913-916) for the reasons of record and the comments below.

The applicant's arguments have been fully considered but are unpersuasive.

The applicant states "Applicants respectfully submit that the discussion hereinabove regarding the deficiencies of the teachings of Van Meir et al., with regard to the rejection of claims 1, 3-8, 15-16, 21 and 37 equally applies to the instant rejection of claim 38 under 35 USC 103(a). The examiner refers the applicant to the examiner's comments hereinabove regarding the purported deficiencies of the teachings of Van Meir et al., with regard to the rejection of claims 1, 3-8, 15-16, 21 and 37. Accordingly, the applicant's arguments are unpersuasive.

Art Unit: 1633

Therefore, the examiner hereby maintains the rejection of claim 38 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Van Meir et al. in view of Shibata et al.

The examiner reiterates the pending rejection below:

Claim 38 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Van Meir et al. (WO02/26192) in view of Shibata et al. (International Journal of Radiation Oncology Biology Physics. 1998; 42(4): 913-916).

Claim 38 is directed to an adenovirus vector comprising an adenovirus gene and a transgene, each under the transcriptional control of a transcriptional regulatory element (TRE) comprising a minimal promoter and a hypoxia responsive element (HRE), wherein the adenovirus gene is selected from the group consisting of an E1B gene, an E2A gene, an E2B gene and an E4 gene, wherein the transgene is a suicide gene selected from the group consisting of a TNF- α gene, a Trail gene, a Bax gene, an HSV-tk gene, a cytosine deaminase gene, a p450 gene and a diphtheria toxin gene, an s-Flt1 gene and an ex-Flt gene, wherein the minimal promoter is selected from the group consisting of the human β -actin minimal promoter, the human EF2 minimal promoter, and the adenovirus E1B minimal promoter.

BASIC INVENTIVE CONCEPT: Van Meir et al. teach, "a recombinant virus genetically engineered to have an hypoxia-responsive element, or a multiplicity of such elements, operably linked to a promoter which is operably linked to a gene or genes which regulate or modulate replication of the virus or encode a therapeutic molecule." (page 7, lines 18-21). Van Meir et al. further describe the recombinant virus as "a recombinant replication-competent adenovirus" and "an hypoxia/HIF-dependent

Art Unit: 1633

replicative adenovirus” (page 9, lines 10 and 13). Van Meir et al. teach an adenovirus containing a minimal promoter, hypoxia-response elements, and the E1 gene (page 28, Figure at line 1).

EACH GENE UNDER CONTROL OF HYPOXIC PROMOTER: Van Meir et al. teach, “a recombinant virus genetically engineered to have an hypoxia-responsive element, or a multiplicity of such elements, operably linked to a promoter which is operably linked to a gene or genes which regulate or modulate replication of the virus or encode a therapeutic molecule.” (page 7, lines 18-21). Van Meir et al. clearly indicate that both (1) genes required for viral replication and (2) therapeutic genes can be placed under control of promoters comprising hypoxia responsive elements. Van Meir et al. demonstrate a specific embodiment of this type: “a viral construct comprising an hypoxia-dependent replicative adenovirus (HYPR-Ad(s)) that expresses an anti-angiogenic factor under hypoxic conditions (HYPR-Ad)” (page 13, lines 26-28). Furthermore, Van Meir et al. teach “a plurality of genes can be expressed in response to hypoxia” (page 20, lines 4-5). Van Meir et al. teach “molecular strategy underlying the design of virus mediated gene therapy systems is to deliver a gene which will inhibit tumor cell growth (e.g., controlling cell cycle or apoptosis), kill the cell (suicide gene), or induce an immune response (immunotherapy).” (page 2, lines 16-18). Van Meir et al. also teach that thymidine kinase is one of the therapeutic suicide genes which can be used in their invention (page 19, lines 28-29 through page 20, line 1). Van Meir et al. teach, “recombinant adenoviruses were able to express...conditionally (HYPR-Ad1) E1A and E1B gene products.” (page 34, lines 1-2).

DEFICIENCIES: Van Meir et al. teaches the general idea of adenovirus vectors in which both (1) an adenovirus genes, (E1A and E1B), and (2) the thymidine kinase gene would be under the control of a transcriptional regulatory element comprising a minimal promoter and hypoxic response elements. Van Meir et al. teach an adenovirus containing a minimal promoter, hypoxia-response elements, and the E1 gene (page 28, Figure at line 1). However, Van Meir et al. do not specifically teach the minimal promoters can be selected from the group consisting of human β -actin minimal promoter, the human EF2 minimal promoter, and the adenovirus E1B minimal promoter.

However, Shibata et al. teach “the application of multiple copies of the HREs [hypoxia-responsive elements] and an E1b minimal promoter appears to have the advantage of great improvement in hypoxia responsiveness.” (Abstract).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to the person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the teachings of Van Meir to incorporate the teachings of Shibata et al., where a resulting adenovirus gene and suicide gene are under the control of E1B minimal promoter and hypoxia-responsive elements.

The person of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to make that modification because Shibata et al. suggest combining hypoxia-responsive elements and an E1b minimal promoter greatly improve hypoxia responsiveness.

An artisan would have expected success, because Shibata et al. suggest that the Van Meir et al. adenovirus could have improved hypoxia responsiveness.

Therefore the adenovirus as taught by Van Meir et al in view of Shibata et al. would have been *prima facie* obvious over the adenovirus of the instant application.

Meir and Shibata

Claim 39 remains rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Van Meir et al. (WO02/26192) in view of Shibata et al. (International Journal of Radiation Oncology Biology Physics. 1998; 42(4): 913-916) for the reasons of record and the comments below.

The applicant's arguments have been fully considered but are unpersuasive.

The applicant states "Applicants respectfully submit that the discussion hereinabove regarding the deficiencies of the teachings of Van Meir et al., with regard to the rejection of claims 1, 3-8, 15-16, 21 and 37 equally applies to the instant rejection of claim 38 under 35 USC 103(a). The examiner refers the applicant to the examiner's comments hereinabove regarding the purported deficiencies of the teachings of Van Meir et al., with regard to the rejection of claims 1, 3-8, 15-16, 21 and 37. Accordingly, the applicant's arguments are unpersuasive.

Therefore, the examiner hereby maintains the rejection of claim 39 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Van Meir et al. in view of Shibata et al.

The examiner reiterates the pending rejection below:

Claim 39 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Van Meir et al. (WO02/26192) in view of Shibata et al. (International Journal of Radiation Oncology Biology Physics. 1998; 42(4): 913-916).

Art Unit: 1633

Claim 39 is directed to an adenovirus vector comprising two adenovirus genes and a transgene, each under the transcriptional control of a transcriptional regulatory element (TRE) comprising a minimal promoter and a hypoxia responsive element (HRE), wherein the adenovirus gene is selected from the group consisting of an E1B gene, an E2A gene, an E2B gene and an E4 gene, wherein the transgene is a suicide gene selected from the group consisting of a TNF- α gene, a Trail gene, a Bax gene, an HSV-tk gene, a cytosine deaminase gene, a p450 gene and a diphtheria toxin gene, an s-Flt1 gene and an ex-Flt gene, wherein the minimal promoter is selected from the group consisting of the human β -actin minimal promoter, the human EF2 minimal promoter, and the adenovirus E1B minimal promoter.

BASIC INVENTIVE CONCEPT: Van Meir et al. teach, “a recombinant virus genetically engineered to have an hypoxia-responsive element, or a multiplicity of such elements, operably linked to a promoter which is operably linked to a gene or genes which regulate or modulate replication of the virus or encode a therapeutic molecule.” (page 7, lines 18-21). Van Meir et al. further describe the recombinant virus as “a recombinant replication-competent adenovirus” and “an hypoxia/HIF-dependent replicative adenovirus” (page 9, lines 10 and 13). Van Meir et al. teach an adenovirus containing a minimal promoter, hypoxia-response elements, and the E1 gene (page 28, Figure at line 1).

EACH GENE UNDER CONTROL OF HYPOXIC PROMOTER: Van Meir et al. teach, “a recombinant virus genetically engineered to have an hypoxia-responsive element, or a multiplicity of such elements, operably linked to a promoter which is

Art Unit: 1633

operably linked to a gene or genes which regulate or modulate replication of the virus or encode a therapeutic molecule.” (page 7, lines 18-21). Van Meir et al. clearly indicate that both (1) genes required for viral replication and (2) therapeutic genes can be placed under control of promoters comprising hypoxia responsive elements. Van Meir et al. demonstrate a specific embodiment of this type: “a viral construct comprising an hypoxia-dependent replicative adenovirus (HYPR-Ad(s)) that expresses an anti-angiogenic factor under hypoxic conditions (HYPR-Ad)” (page 13, lines 26-28). Furthermore, Van Meir et al. teach “a plurality of genes can be expressed in response to hypoxia” (page 20, lines 4-5). Van Meir et al. teach “molecular strategy underlying the design of virus mediated gene therapy systems is to deliver a gene which will inhibit tumor cell growth (e.g., controlling cell cycle or apoptosis), kill the cell (suicide gene), or induce an immune response (immunotherapy).” (page 2, lines 16-18). Van Meir et al. also teach that thymidine kinase is one of the therapeutic suicide genes which can be used in their invention (page 19, lines 28-29 through page 20, line 1). Van Meir et al. teach, “recombinant adenoviruses were able to express...conditionally (HYPR-Ad1) E1A and E1B gene products.” (page 34, lines 1-2).

DEFICIENCIES: Van Meir et al. teaches the general idea of adenovirus vectors in which both (1) an adenovirus genes, (E1A and E1B), and (2) the thymidine kinase gene would be under the control of a transcriptional regulatory element comprising a minimal promoter and hypoxic response elements. Regarding the use of two adenoviral genes, Van Meir et al. teach “Using standard genetic engineering methods, any suitable promoter can be linked to HRE, which are then linked to a gene(s) in a particular virus

Art Unit: 1633

that regulates or modulates virus replication. A variety of genes and/or their products are known to those skilled in the art that regulate or modulate viral replication.” (page 18, lines 2-5). Van Meir et al. specifically uses E1A as an example of such genes. However, Van Meir et al. do not specifically teach the adenovirus genes E2A, E2B, or E4 can be among those genes regulated by hypoxia-responsive promoters. However, Meir et al. teach “E1B 55K, in conjunction with adenovirus E4orf6 gene product has two functions during viral production” (page 19, lines 23-24). Regarding the minimal promoter, Van Meir et al. teach an adenovirus containing a minimal promoter, hypoxia-response elements, and the E1 gene (page 28, Figure at line 1). However, Van Meir et al. do not specifically teach the minimal promoters can be selected from the group consisting of human β -actin minimal promoter, the human EF2 minimal promoter, and the adenovirus E1B minimal promoter.

However, Shibata et al. teach “the application of multiple copies of the HREs [hypoxia-responsive elements] and an E1b minimal promoter appears to have the advantage of great improvement in hypoxia responsiveness.” (Abstract).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to the person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the teachings of Van Meir to construct an adenovirus comprising the two adenovirus genes, E1B and E4, each under the control of a hypoxia-responsive promoter, further comprising the suicide gene, thymidine kinase also under control of a hypoxia-responsive promoter. Additionally, it would have been obvious to the person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify the teachings of Van Meir to incorporate the teachings of Shibata et al., where a

Art Unit: 1633

resulting adenovirus gene and suicide gene are under the control of E1B minimal promoter and hypoxia-responsive elements.

The person of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to make that modification because Shibata et al. suggest combining hypoxia-responsive elements and an E1b minimal promoter greatly improve hypoxia responsiveness.

An artisan would have expected success, because Shibata et al. suggest that the Van Meir et al. adenovirus could have improved hypoxia responsiveness. An artisan would have expected success, because Van Meir et al. demonstrates a specific embodiment of adenovirus comprising E1A and E1B operably linked to a hypoxic promoter. Therefore, a skilled artisan would expect substituting other adenovirus genes which control viral replication for either of these genes would be successful.

Therefore the adenovirus as taught by Van Meir et al in view of Shibata et al. would have been *prima facie* obvious over the adenovirus of the instant application.

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

No claims are allowed.

Examiner Contact Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to **Scott Long** whose telephone number is **571-272-9048**.

The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday, 9am - 5pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, **Joseph Woitach** can be reached on **571-272-0739**. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

/Scott Long/
Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1633